



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

<b>Applicant</b>	California Trout	<b>County</b>	Mono, Inyo, San Bernardino & Kern
<b>Project Title</b>	Inyo-Mono IRWMP Round 2	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 685,751
	Planning Grant Proposal: Fulfilling Plan Standards through Focused Planning Studies and Programmatic Operations	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 1,045,725

**Project Description** To respond to critical planning needs of the region as well as maintain momentum necessary to advance the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. The Inyo-Mono IRWM Program strives to build regional capacity to more effectively manage water resources as well as become more financially self-sufficient.

### Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	5
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>33</b>

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. Linkages between the proposed tasks and how they relate to the plan standards are not clearly defined. The Impacts and Benefits and the Coordination Standards were not included in the list of standards being addressed in the existing plan, nor are they tied to the work contained in the Proposal. Table 1 claims most of the standards will be met, but the subsequent tasks do not support the claims. The task descriptions presented are vague, rendering it insufficiently detailed to be the scope of work in a grant agreement.
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The tasks do not specifically address how the region plans to facilitate and support sustained DAC participation in the planning process. The only mention of including DACs in the planning process is in task 2.A.1, where focused outreach will be conducted on sediment and flood potential issues.
- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed. The Schedule lists each task from the work plan along with the timeline it will take to complete. The Schedule format is easy to follow and understand.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and the documentation is insufficient. The Budget discussion lacks the supporting documentation to establish the basis of the estimates for most tasks, making it difficult to determine if the costs are reasonable or logical. The organization of the Budget matches the Work Plan and Schedule except for their “other costs” item. The logic for the distribution and amount of overhead is missing. Each task has a project administration budget, in addition there is an overall “other costs” item, which is for support of Cal Trout’s office for supplies, rent, bills, etc., and there is another 12% of the entire budget added in for O & A. This amount of administrative funds is not supported by the Work Plan task descriptions.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012*

---

- **Program Preference** The proposal sufficiently documents that 11 of the 15 preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.